The Anti-Racist Paradox: How the Fear of Racism Manufactures Resentment

Xeno-impunity, inverted imputation, and the anti-racist paradox

There is a paradox at the heart of many Western societies today.

The more institutions try to avoid racism by refusing to name origin, refusing to acknowledge patterns, refusing to treat certain offenders as fully responsible adults, and refusing to prioritize victims when the facts are politically uncomfortable, the more they create the very conditions in which racism grows.

This is the anti-racist paradox.

An anti-racism that refuses truth does not eliminate hatred.

It manufactures resentment.

> It tells the public: do not generalize.
> But it hides the facts that would allow people not to generalize.
>
> It tells victims: trust the system.
> But it treats their testimony as a threat to social cohesion.
>
> It tells citizens: origin does not matter.
> But origin quietly matters whenever institutions become cautious, indulgent, silent, or evasive.
>
> It tells society: we must avoid xenophobia.
> But it produces the perception of asymmetric justice — and nothing generates xenophobia faster than the belief that the law is no longer equal.

This is where xeno-impunity begins.

Xeno-impunity — or alien impunity — does not mean that every foreigner is impune. It does not mean that origin makes anyone guilty. It means something more precise: that in certain contexts, external

origin, foreignness, protected alterity, or minority status may operate as an informal shield against full responsibility.

Not in the law.

In the reflexes of institutions.

In the hesitation to deport.
In the refusal to record patterns.
In the reluctance to name origin.
In the paternalistic explanation of violence.
In the fear of public scandal.
In the instinct to protect the narrative before protecting the victim.

This is often presented as anti-racism.

But it is not anti-racism.

It is paternalism.

A serious anti-racism treats every person as a responsible adult before the law. It refuses collective blame, but it also refuses collective indulgence. It says: no origin condemns you, but no origin protects you either.

The post-national State often fails at both.

It tells the native not to generalize, while generalizing suspicion against the native himself.

It tells the public not to see origin, while letting origin shape institutional caution.

It tells victims not to politicize their suffering, while allowing the official narrative to politicize their silence.

And then comes the deeper mutation.

Once institutions become afraid of naming the offender, they become afraid of those who name him.

That is inverted imputation.

At first, the system avoids looking too closely at the offender.

Then it begins to monitor those who insist on looking.

Finally, it may punish the victim, the witness, the journalist, the native, or the citizen who publicly names the pattern.

The result is reverse imputation.

The victim becomes suspicious.

Not because he committed the original crime, but because his reaction is treated as the greater political danger.

He may have been robbed, beaten, raped, stabbed, humiliated, or threatened.

But if he says the wrong thing about the offender's origin, if he connects the case to failed deportations, asylum abuse, migration policy, integration collapse, or repeated patterns, he becomes the problem.

The primary crime is replaced by the secondary crime.

The primary crime is the actual aggression.

The secondary crime is the social reaction the aggression might provoke.

And increasingly, the post-national State appears more terrified of the secondary crime than of the primary one.

> It fears outrage more than violence.
> It fears "hate speech" more than institutional failure.
> It fears political interpretation more than victimization.
> It fears the public conclusion more than the private wound.

The victim is tolerated only as long as he remains silent.

> He may suffer, but he must suffer correctly.
> He may be wounded, but he must not become evidence.
> He may be a victim, but he must not become an argument.

This is the core of the anti-racist paradox.

By suppressing discussion of origin, the system does not prevent collective blame.

It encourages it.

Because when institutions refuse to impute individual guilt clearly, society begins to suspect group guilt vaguely.

When data is hidden, rumor replaces statistics.

When victims are silenced, resentment replaces justice.

When truth is treated as dangerous, hatred becomes the substitute for order.

This is why xeno-impunity is dangerous even from an anti-racist point of view.

Because the most effective way to prevent ethnic hatred is not to hide reality.

It is to individualize responsibility.

To say clearly: this person did this act.

Not his group.

Not his origin.

Not his community.

This person.

Correct imputation prevents collective hatred because it gives society a precise object of justice. Incorrect imputation, by contrast, leaves guilt floating in the air. And when guilt floats, it eventually attaches itself to groups.

That is why the anti-racist paradox is so destructive.

It tries to prevent racism by preventing speech.

But the real prevention of racism requires truth, precision, punishment of the guilty, protection of the victim, and transparency of patterns.

There can be no anti-racism without responsibility.

There can be no social cohesion without truth.

There can be no justice where the victim fears not only the aggressor, but the official narrative that arrives afterward.

The answer is not hatred.

The answer is not collective blame.

The answer is not to say that origin makes anyone guilty.

The answer is exactly the opposite: correct imputation.

> The offender must be imputed as offender.
> The victim must be recognized as victim.
> The witness must be allowed to say what he has seen.
> Origin must serve neither to condemn innocently nor to acquit culpably.

No person is guilty because of his origin.

But no person is less responsible because of his origin.

That is the principle the post-national State has forgotten.

And this is the anti-racist paradox:

When anti-racism becomes fear of truth, it produces mistrust.

When it becomes paternalism, it produces inequality.

When it becomes narrative control, it produces resentment.

When it refuses to punish individuals clearly, it pushes society toward blaming groups vaguely.

And so the system that claims to fight xenophobia may end up accelerating it.

Not because hatred is justified.

But because injustice, silence, and inverted blame are the perfect conditions for hatred to grow.

The way out is not more taboo.

The way out is correct imputation.

> Same crime, same response.
> Same risk, same prevention.
> Same victim, same protection.

No collective guilt.

No protected impunity.

No victim turned into suspect.

Justice begins when the offender is again treated as offender, the victim as victim, and the truth as a condition of peace rather than a threat to the narrative.